DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 485 TM 820 498

AUTHOR MacKay, D. A.; Doherty, M.
TITLE Educational Opportunity Fund Junior High Program Evaluation. Summary.
INSTITUTION Evaluation Consultants, Ltd., Edmonton (Alberta).
SPONS AGENCY Alberta Dept. of Education, Edmonton. Planning and Research Branch.
PUB DATE Feb 82
NOTE 172p.
AVAILABLE FROM Planning and Research Branch; Alberta Education, 9th Floor, Devonian Building, 11160 Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alberta T5K 0L2.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Tests; Foreign Countries; *High Risk Students; Junior High Schools; *Junior High School Students; Learning Problems; *Program Evaluation; *Special Programs; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

In 1979, a special program was implemented for junior high students unable to benefit from regular programming due to a failure to cope with regular school courses, irregular and non-attendance, disruptive behavior, or poor self-concept. Quantitative and qualitative data were obtained from site visits, achievement tests in reading and mathematics, a questionnaire survey, a random sample of student case studies, and an analysis of project files. It was concluded that the Educational Opportunities Fund (E.O.F.) program is effective and appropriate. Among the recommendations included are the continuation of the E.O.E. (junior high) program and the development of a similar program at the senior high school level. This report contains a comprehensive bibliography, the evaluation instruments, and the achievement test results. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220485

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. P. Eddy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FUND

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM

EVALUATION

Summary

- by -

D. A. MacKay
&
M. Doherty

Under Contract to
Alberta Education
Edmonton, Alberta

February, 1982

planning & research

Alberta
EDUCATION

SUMMARY REPORT

An external evaluation of the Educational Opportunities Fund (E.O.F.) Junior High program was carried out during the 1980-81 school year by Evaluation Consultants (Edmonton) Limited. The evaluation report was prepared by D. A. (Al) MacKay and Maryanne Doherty, the two principal investigators.

The study was designed to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. How effective and appropriate was the E.O.F. (Jr. High) program in terms of:

    a. its overall purposes and rationale
    b. Policies, regulations and guidelines
    c. Activities of E.O.F. office
    d. Activities of Alberta Education regional offices?

2. How effective and appropriate were the various projects in terms of:

    a. Rationale and objectives
    b. Planning activities and proposal
    c. Implementation
    d. Effects?

The data required to answer these questions and to provide information for both formative and summative evaluation purposes were obtained through:

1. Site visits to 15 of the 137 projects. During the site vists, a number (usually 5) of adults and 3 students were interviewed, observations of classrooms and/or work study activities were made, and project files and materials were examined.

2. The contents of a random sample of 36 project files were analyzed to determine how well the proposed projects compiled with E.O.F. policy guidelines.

3. A province-wide questionnaire survey of program participants sought opinions about the local projects as well as about the provincial program. Responses were obtained from 83.2% of a structured random sample of 36 projects as well as from persons associated with the 15 site-visit projects.

4. Case studies of 42 students randomly selected from students enroled in the 15 site-visit projects were carried out. Data for the case studies came from three sources: (a) interviews of the students by the site-visit teams, (b) project files and records, and (c) reports on student progress supplied by persons associated with the students.

5. Achievement testing of students in 11 of the 15 site-visit projects was carried out in May-June of 1981. The MACOSA (Grade VI) test of reading and a specially modified version of the MACOSA (Grade VI) mathematics test were used for this part of the study. Achievement testing was not feasible in the other 4 site-visit projects because of the nature of the program offered in those projects.

6. A review of the literature on similar programs was also used as a source of information. A preliminary review, in the Fall of 1980, provided information on evaluation methods and a further review, after the results of this report had been obtained, provided a background against which to discuss the results.

In general, the evaluation project relied on a wide variety of data sources designed to provide for triangulation of data sources. Judgements about the evaluation question were based on corroborative evidence drawn from the various sources, thus, it was argued, ensuring that the conclusions would be trustworthy.

The **conclusions** of the study were as follows:

1. The E.O.F. program is effective and appropriate. However, academic improvement should be defined to mean functional levels of attainment.
2. The policies and procedures were effective.
3. The provincial E.O.F. office played an important role in development, implementation and monitoring of the program.
4. Regional offices of the provincial department of education provided assistance where necessary.
5. The rationale and objectives of the projects were effective and appropriate.
6. The quality of planning and proposal development was acceptable.
7. Projects had been implemented in accordance with project proposals.
8. Local projects had been highly effective.

The evaluation team made the following **recommendations**:

1. The E.O.F. (Jr. High) program should be continued.
2. The E.O.F. Coordinator's Office should continue to administer the program.
3. Consideration should be given to developing a policy which would provide a program with similar objectives at the senior high school level.
4. Studies should be undertaken of:
   a. recruitment, training and retention of teachers
   b. the long-term effects of the program
   c. the implications of E.O.F. programs for regular junior high programs
   d. the nature of effective teaching in E.O.F. classrooms.
5. Consideration should be given to a planned variation strategy for future E.O.F. program development and implementation.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Dan Ewasiuk	-	Alberta Education
Merv Kowalchuk	-	Alberta Education
Clarence Rhodes	-	Alberta Education
Al Cleveland	-	Alberta School Trustees' Assocation
Peter Stear	-	Representing the Alberta Teachers' Association
Tom Blowers	-	Edmonton Public School District

The complete report may be obtained from the office of your local Superintendent of Schools, Regional Office of Alberta Education, ERIC Document Services and Planning & Research Branch.

Planning and Research Branch
Alberta Education
9th Floor, Devonian Building
11160 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 0L2 (Telephone 403/427-8216)

82/4

ABSTRACT

The Educational Opportunities Fund (E.O.F.) (Jr. High) was implemented in 1979 to provide special programming for junior high students who had not been able to benefit from regular programming. Target students possessed some or all of the following characteristics: (1) failure to cope successfully with regular school courses; (2) irregular and non-attendance; (3) disruptive behavior; (4) poor self-concept.

This evaluation study, conducted in 1980-81, used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative date obtained from: (1) site visits; (2) achievement tests—reading and mathematics; (3) a province-wide questionnaire survey; (4) case studies of a random sample of students; and (5) analysis of project files.

The conclusions were that: (1) the E.O.F. program is effective and appropriate. However academic improvement should be defined to mean functional levels of attainment; (2) the policies and procedures were effective; (3) the provincial E.O.F. office played an important role in development, implementation and monitoring of the program; (4) regional offices of the provincial department of education provided assistance where necessary; (5) the rationale and objectives of the projects were effective and appropriate; (6) the quality of planning and proposal development was acceptable; (7) projects had been implemented in accordance with project proposals; (8) local projects had been highly effective.

The evaluation team made the following recommendations:

(1) the E.O.F. (Jr. High) program should be continued; (2) the E.O.F. Coordinator's office should continue to administer the program; (3) consideration should be given to developing a policy which would provide a program with similar objectives at the senior high school level; (4) studies should be undertaken of: (a) recruitment, training and retention of teachers, (b) the long-term effects of the program, (c) the implications of E.O.F. programs for regular junior high programs, and (d) the nature of effective teaching in E.O.F. classrooms; (5) consideration should be given to a planned variation strategy for future E.O.F. program development and implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The co-authors of this report wish to acknowledge a number of people who assisted with data collection and analysis and with the preparation of the report. Larry Fedigan, Yvonne Walmsley and Linda Fedigan played key roles in data collection. Daiyo Sawada modified the MACOSA mathematics test so that it could be used in this study. Ann and Mark MacKay and Chris Propkop provided expert assistance in the data analysis. Debbie Kozak produced questionnaires, forms and letters and prepared the penultimate draft of the report; Margaret Voice prepared the final draft of the report.

Thanks are due also to the evaluation project steering committee which was comprised of Dan Ewasiuk, Merv Kowalchuk and Clarence Rhodes from Alberta Education, Al Cleveland from the Alberta School Trustees' Association, Peter Stear representing the Alberta Teachers' Association and Tom Blowers from the Edmonton Public School District. Their advice and assistance was crucial to successful completion of the project.

Finally, to the professional staff, parents, employers and students associated with the E.O.F. projects we studied and visited must go our thanks and best wishes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS	3
RESEARCH PROCEDURES	4
Rationale	4
Data Sources	5
Analysis of files	5
Site visits	7
Province-wide survey	9
Achievement tests	10
Student case studies	11
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	12
Results of Analysis of Proposals	12
The Site Visits	15
Summary of project characteristics	15
The interview sample	16
Judgements on the projects	17
Main effects of the projects	19
Proposed changes	20
Results of Province-Wide Survey	21
Background information	21
Achievement of local objectives	22
Positive side-effects of local projects	23
Effect upon school work habits	24
Effect upon student self-concept	25

Page

Demands on time and energy 25

Community reaction to the project 26

Employers' attitudes to the project 26

Parents' attitudes to the projects 27

Achievement of provincial objectives 27

Administrative requirements 28

Preferred funding method 28

Opinions on continuation 29

Achievement of local objectives 30

Positive side-effects of local projects 30

Effects upon student attitude 31

Effect upon school work habits 32

Effect upon student self-concept 32

Demands on time and energy 33

Community reaction to the project 34

Employers' attitudes to the project 34

Parent attitudes to the projects 35

Achievement of provincial objectives 36

Administrative requirements 36

Positive side-effects 37

Negative side-effects 38

Proposed changes 39

Achievement Test Results 40

Student Case Studies 43

Page

Some Areas for Further Study 47

Teacher recruitment, training and retention 47

The re-entry problem 48

Long-term effects of the program 48

The regular junior high program 49

CONCLUSIONS 50

Effectiveness and Appropriateness 50

Overall purposes and rationale 50

Provincial policies, regulations and guidelines 51

Activities of the E.O.F. Office 52

Activities of Alberta Education Regional Offices 52

Effectiveness of the Projects 53

Project rationale and objectives 53

Planning activities and proposals 54

Project implementation 54

Effectiveness of projects 54

Discussion of the Conclusions 55

Results of the literature review 55

RECOMMENDATIONS 63

Concluding Statement 63

BIBLIOGRAPHY 65

APPENDIX A. INSTRUMENTS 75

APPENDIX B. REPORTS OF SITE VISITS 96

APPENDIX C. ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS 130

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.1	Congruency between Project Files and Criteria	12
1.2	Funds Allocated to Internal Evaluation	14
2.1	Summary of Characteristics of Site Visit Projects . . .	16
2.2	Summary of Sample Interviewed	17
2.3	Evaluator's Judgements about Projects	18
2.4	Summary of Main Effects of Projects	19
2.5	Summary of Proposed Changes	20
3.1	Positions Held by Questionnaire Respondents	21
3.2	Years Associated with E.O.F. Project	22
3.3	Achievement of Local Project Objectives	23
3.4	Positive Side-Effects of Projects	23
3.5	Effect of the Local Project upon Student Attitudes . .	24
3.6	Effect of the Local Project upon School Work Habits . .	24
3.7	Effect of the Local Project upon Self-Concept of Students	25
3.8	Demands of Project on Time and Energy	25
3.9	Community Reaction to the Local Project	26
3.10	Employers' Attitudes to the Local Project	26
3.11	Parents' Attitudes to the Local Project	27
3.12	Rating of Province-Wide Achievement of Objectives . . .	27
3.13	Administrative Requirements of Provincial E.O.F. . . .	28
3.14	Preferred Funding Method for E.O.F.	28
3.15	Opinions on Continuation of E.O.F. Beyond 1982	29
3.16	Achievement of Local Project Objectives	30

Table		Page
3.17	Positive Side-Effects of Project	31
3.18	Effect of the Local Project upon Student Attitudes . .	31
3.19	Effect of the Local Project upon School Work Habits . .	32
3.20	Effect of the Local Project upon Self-Concept of Students	33
3.21	Demands of Project on Time and Energy	33
3.22	Community Reaction to the Local Project	34
3.23	Employers' Attitudes to the Local Project	35
3.24	Parent Attitudes to the Local Project	35
3.25	Rating of Province-Wide Achievement of Objectives . . .	36
3.26	Administrative Requirements of Provincial E.O.F. . . .	37
3.27	Positive Side-Effects of the E.O.F. Program	38
3.28	Negative Side-Effects of the E.O.F. Program	39
3.29	Proposed Changes in E.O.F. Procedures and Regulations	40
4.1	Comparison of Project Results in Reading with MACOSA Results	41
4.2	Comparison of Project Results in Mathematics with MACOSA Results	42
5.1	Summary of Student Case Studies	44

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

This evaluation study was commissioned by Alberta Education in the fall of 1980. Its general objective was to provide an assessment of the effectiveness of the Junior High component of the Educational Opportunities Fund. According to the 1979 E.O.F. (Junior High) Policy Manual, the Junior High component was "intended to fund special educational programming for selected junior high school pupils who have not been able to benefit fully from regular school programming and who are likely to leave school early and are poorly prepared for integration into society."

In the Policy Manual, three objectives for the program were identified:

1. The upgrading of basic academic skills to functional levels.
2. The development of skills, habits and attitudes necessary for successful integration into the world of work.
3. The development of skills, habits and attitudes necessary for successful integration into the social aspects of the regular adolescent and larger societies.

Target students for the Junior High component were to display some or all of the following characteristics:

1. Failure to cope successfully with regular school courses.
2. Irregular and non-attendance.
3. Disruptive behavior.
4. Poor self-concept and minimal acceptance by peers.

Funding of the component was available to public and separate school boards and allocation of the funds was on a per-pupil basis. In 1979, for example, the per-pupil grant rate was $32.15. The grant ceiling for any school system was determined by multiplying the number of eligible junior high students by the rate in effect during a particular school year. In each case, a project proposal had to be submitted by the school system to the E.O.F. Office of Alberta Education, and funding was contingent upon approval of the proposed project.

In most cases, the projects were three years in length so that approval of the proposal led to an allocation of funds for each of the three budget years: 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82.

The March, 1980 master list of E.O.F. projects showed that 137 projects had been approved across Alberta. The total E.O.F. budget for the three years was 10.5 million dollars (a yearly average of 3.5 million dollars); the lowest project budget was $450.00, while the highest single project budget was 1.3 million dollars.

The remainder of this report is comprised of the following sections:

I. The Evaluation Questions
II. Research Procedures
III. Summary of Results
IV. Conclusions
V. Recommendations
VI. Appendices

I. THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation study was designed to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How effective and appropriate was the E.O.F. (Jr. High) program in terms of:
    a. Its overall purposes and rationale
    b. Policies, regulations and guidelines
    c. Activities of the E.O.F. office
    d. Activities of Alberta Education regional offices?
2. How effective and appropriate were the various projects in terms of:
    a. Rationale and objectives
    b. Planning activities and proposals
    c. Implementation
    d. Effects?

Besides attempting to answer these questions, the evaluation sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. To make a summative evaluation statement about the E.O.F. Junior High component.
2. To provide formative evaluation information for the projects involved in the site visits.
3. To develop policy recommendations for consideration by Alberta Education.

II. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Rationale

This study used a somewhat complex mixture of qualitative and quantitative research methods. The study was conceived of as being a descriptive rather than an experimental study. There were no ready opportunities to use strong experimental designs involving control or comparison groups and, although much of the data obtained in the study lent itself to quantitative analyses, the study, as a total story, should be viewed as a large-scale case study.

Despite the evaluator's inability to use some stronger experimental designs, every effort was made to use corroborating evidence drawn from different sources. For example, qualitative interview data, quantitative data from a province-wide questionnaire survey, results of a careful analysis of documents, as well as some achievement test data, were all brought to bear upon the evaluation questions identified in Section I.

It can be argued that, although each source of data had its own inherent limits in terms of validity and/or reliability, when the information on one or another of the evaluation questions pointed very clearly in one direction, it was possible to draw fairly clear and supportable conclusions.

It should be noted that random selection procedures were used for the province-wide survey and for the student case studies and, therefore, inferences can be made regarding the total population of E.O.F. projects and the persons associated with them.

Data Sources

The data sources were as follows:

1. Content of E.O.F. files
2. Site visits to fifteen projects
3. A province-wide questionnaire survey of participants
4. An achievement test study in a sample of projects
5. Case studies of students selected from the "site-visit" projects
6. Review of selected literature.

The questions which were woven among all six of these data sources stemmed from the general evaluation questions; but, more specifically, were of the following form:

1. What were the project objectives, and how was the project implemented?
2. What direct effects did the project have upon students?
3. What side-effects (positive, negative or neutral) did the projects have?
4. What changes should be made in the projects?
5. What evidence was available about the E.O.F. policy and about possible revisions in that policy?

In order to answer these five questions, the following data collection techniques were used:

1. Analysis of files. A sample of thirty-six projects was randomly selected from the official master list of E.O.F. projects. None of the fifteen projects which had been selected for site visits

was included in this sample. The population of projects was stratified on the following variables: geographic location (northern, central, southern Alberta) and type of jurisdiction (division, county, separate school district, public school district). Two members of the evaluation team then examined each of the thirty-six project files.

Using the Document Analysis Form (see Appendix A), the two evaluators made independent assessments of the projects as they appeared "on paper." The key questions addressed by the document analysis were:

1. How congruent was the proposed project with E.O.F. policy in terms of objectives and target pupils?

2. How strong was the relationship between proposed objectives and proposed activities?

3. What was the overall quality of the proposal?

4. What was the quality of the proposed procedures for internal evaluation?

5. What percentage of the project budget is allocated, in terms of direct costs, to evaluation?

The format used for this analysis was drawn from the approach used in the evaluation of the E.O.F. (Elementary) component (MacKay, 1975).

Following the independent assessments, the two evaluators worked jointly on the same set of files until agreement was reached as to what judgement would be appropriate for a particular project file. It should be noted that the independent assessments were approximately 80% in agreement and, after consultation with each other, the evaluators were in complete agreement with each other.

2. Site visits. The evaluator obtained a list of thirty-one projects from the E.O.F. Coordinator. These projects were, according to the Coordinator, broadly representative of the total population of projects and, moreover, possessed a number of potentially interesting features in terms of variation around the main themes of E.O.F.

The evaluator then selected a sample of fifteen which was designed to represent the geographic distribution, as well as the program variations which were evident among the original group of thirty-one projects. Later, the evaluator compared these files with a random sample of projects and determined that, at least in terms of the file information, the sample of fifteen did not appear to be biased.

Two visits were made to each of the fifteen projects. A brief visit in the fall of 1980 was used to obtain information about any changes in the way the projects had been implemented, to determine what data were routinely available at each site, and, most importantly, to establish with the project staffs, the communication links which would be needed for the main data collection activities. Then, during the January to April, 1981 period, a full day visit was made to each project.

The site visit teams were:

1. A. MacKay and Larry Fedigan
2. Larry Fedigan and Linda Fedigan
3. M. Doherty and Y. Walmsley

MacKay and Doherty were the principal co-investigators for the evaluation study; both of the Fedigans had considerable experience in

the use of various research techniques (e.g., Linda Fedigan is a professional anthropologist); Yvonne Walmsley is a specialist in program design and evaluation.

A typical site visit enabled the team to:

1. Interview a number (typically five to eight) of adults associated with the project. These included such persons as the E.O.F. teacher, school administrators, central office staff, employers, parents, other professional staff. Selection of these adults was made by the project contact person using criteria supplied by the external evaluator.

2. Interview, where appropriate, three students who had been randomly selected by the evaluator from a list of 1980-81 students provided by the teachers.

3. Examine project files, curriculum materials and facilities.

4. Observe, where possible, students in the school or work setting.

In addition, the teachers were asked to give the evaluator follow-up information on 1979-80 students and, near the end of the 1980-81 school year, information on the status of each of the students selected for the case studies was obtained by mail. Finally, for the projects in which achievement testing seemed to be appropriate, the teachers administered the Grade Six MACOSA tests in mathematics and reading, and mailed the test booklets to the external evaluator for scoring and analysis.

3. Province-wide survey. Three types of information were sought: (1) background information about the respondent, (2) respondents' opinions about various facets of the E.O.F. program as measured by Likert-scale items, and (3) respondents' opinions, comments and suggestions as tapped by a number of open-ended items. In Appendix A, a copy of the questionnaire, which was distributed to a sample of 435 persons, is provided.

The Likert-scale items, in Section A of the questionnaire, sought respondents' opinions about the local project with which they were acquainted, while the items in Section B focused on the provincial E.O.F. program. Items numbered 14, 15 and 18 asked the respondents to list in a limited (to three responses), open-ended format their estimate of the positive side-effects, negative side-effects and suggested changes in the regulations or procedures used in the provincial program.

The sample of 435 was comprised of five persons at each of the fifteen site visit projects (n = 75) and ten persons from each of the thirty-six projects (n = 360) selected randomly from the master list (March, 1980) of E.O.F. projects.

Analysis of the data obtained in the province-wide survey was of two types: (1) quantitative analysis, in terms of frequency distributions of the background items and the Likert-scale items, and (2) qualitative analysis of the open-ended item responses. The method of content analysis was used on the open-ended items, thus enabling the researchers to develop quantitative summaries, in terms of frequency of occurrence, of the qualitative (i.e., verbal) statements made by

the respondents. In Section III (Results), a list of the most frequently made comments, as well as the most striking or salient (in the judgement of the evaluator) comments is provided.

4. Achievement tests. As a result of the first round of site visits in the fall of 1980, the evaluator decided that the achievement tests would not be appropriate for use in all of the fifteen projects. In fact, six of the projects were operating in ways which made a standardized achievement testing approach inappropriate. Alberta Education was able to make the MACOSA tests available to the external evaluator, and because provincial norms in terms of the percentage of students obtaining correct answers on each test item were available in the MACOSA reports, the MACOSA reading and mathematics tests seemed to be appropriate for this study. For this study, the Grade 6 MACOSA test was deemed to be reasonably appropriate.

The mathematics test appeared to be too lengthy for use with students of the type selected as the E.O.F. target group. Therefore, a shortened version of the test was produced. (The technical report on this revision is provided in Appendix A of this evaluation report.)

In the absence of base-line data on pre-project achievement levels (which would have had to be obtained in June of 1980 or early September of 1980 before the evaluation project got underway), it was decided that the tests should be used within a "posttest only" design which, according to Campbell and Stanley (1963), is to be preferred over the pretest-posttest design.

5. Student case studies. Because the evaluator believed that information about a sample of students would provide concrete information as to E.O.F. project effects, a student case study was incorporated into the overall evaluation strategy. The data were qualitative in nature in that they were based on the estimates, observations and opinions of a group of adults who had been closely associated with the student. This group was comprised of teachers, parents, employers, administrators or counsellors, who were believed to be in a position to answer the questions on the Report Form on Students (June, 1981). The Form (see Appendix A) was sent, in a batch, to the project contact person at each of the fifteen site visit projects. The contact person, in turn, distributed the form to adults representing the categories mentioned above. The student group about whom the respondents reported was comprised of the randomly selected sample of three pupils per project which had been selected by the evaluator for interviewing during the site visit.

The data contained in the Report Form on Students were processed by means of the same kind of content analysis methodology that was used on the other qualitative (verbal) data obtained during other parts of the evaluation study.

III. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Results of Analysis of Proposals

This part of the report contains the results of the analysis of the project proposals. Table 1.1 contains a summary of the judgements with respect to five criteria for project "quality" as evidenced by the written proposal.

Table 1.1

Congruency between Project Files and Criteria
(n = 36)

Criterion	Judgements (%) High	Medium	Low
1. (a) Target Pupils	58%	33%	9%
(b) Objectives	78%	19%	3%
2. Relationship of Activities to Objectives	50%	36%	14%
3. Overall Quality	36%	42%	22%
4. Evaluation Procedures	22%	50%	28%

On criterion 1(a), the selection of target pupils, 58% of the projects were judged to be highly congruent with E.O.F. policy, 33% were moderately congruent while 9% were low in congruence with stated E.O.F. policy. For criterion 1(b), the congruency of project objectives with E.O.F. policy, the judgement was that 78% were highly congruent, 19% were moderately congruent and 3% were at a low level of congruence.

On criterion 2, the degree of relationship between project activities and project objectives, the judgement was that the relationship was high in 50% of cases, moderate in 36% and low in 14% of the projects examined.

In terms of overall quality (criterion 3), 36% were judged to be of high quality, 42% were of medium quality, and 22% were of low quality.

Finally, on criterion 4, quality of internal evaluation procedures, only 22% were judged to be of high quality, while 50% were medium and 28% were of low quality.

In Table 1.2, a detailed breakdown of the information recorded on Item 5 of the Document Analysis Form is provided. The table provides a code number for each of the thirty-six projects, the funds allocated for evaluation, the total project budget, the percentage of funds assigned for evaluation, and an indication that, for project 6, it was impossible to determine what the situation with respect to internal evaluation was.

The following statements summarize the information presented in Table 1.2:

1. Of a total of 2.4 million dollars in project budgets, approximately 11 thousand dollars were assigned to internal evaluation.

2. The allocation for internal evaluation constituted only 0.4% of total budgets. It should be noted, however, that there are likely to be many evaluation activities at the local project level that are not reflected by the direct budget allocations.

3. In nineteen of the thirty-six projects (52%), no funds were specifically allocated to evaluation.

Table 1.2

Funds Allocated to Internal Evaluation
(n = 36)

Project	Funds Allocated for Internal Evaluation	Total Budget	%
1	$ 0	$ 20,250	0
2	0	30,000	0
3	0	12,000	0
4	3,000	692,000	1.433
5	600	62,000	0.967
6		Unable to determine	
7	0	42,600	0
8	0	35,044	0
9	600	25,270	2.37
10	0	66,750	0
11	0	85,254	0
12	225	25,526	0.88
13	225	84,270	0.26
14	300	158,851	0.18
15	1,000	34,600	2.89
16	365	27,234	1.34
17	0	58,446	0
18	0	10,654	0
19	300	5,790	5.18
20	300	10,600	2.83
21	0	38,400	0
22	800	133,346	0.59
23	600	92,100	0.65
24	0	13,050	0
25	0	105,000	0
26	0	22,086	0
27	0	2,100	0
28	600	35,200	1.70
29	0	14,616	0
30	1,500	195,300	0.76
31	300	13,700	2.18
32	0	95,475	0
33	0	86,100	0
34	900	94,725	0.95
35	0	7,137	0
36	0	1,555	0
Total	$11,615	$2,437,229	0.476

The Site Visits

The reports on the fifteen projects are provided in Appendix B of this evaluation report. In each case, a brief description of the project is provided, followed by a list of the perceived effects the project has had upon students and, thirdly, a list of suggested changes in the project or in the procedures and policies of the provincial E.O.F. program. In this section of the report, a summary of the results of the site visits will be presented under five headings: (1) summary of project characteristics, (2) information on the number of persons interviewed at each site, (3) a summary of the judgements made with respect to a number of categories of project performance, (4) a summary of the main effects of the projects, and (5) a summary of the proposed changes in project or program operation.

1. Summary of project characteristics. In Table 2.1 a summary of characteristics of the fifteen projects with respect to three questions is provided. The information in the table shows that in every case the project funds are allocated almost entirely to the salaries of professional staff. The degree of integration of the E.O.F. project with regular school programs varies considerably, as shown by the judgements reported in the second column of the table. Five of the projects were almost completely segregated while three were judged to be "completely" integrated. In eight of the fifteen projects a work experience component was in place.

Table 2.1

Summary of Characteristics of Site Visit Projects

Project	Most of the Project's Funds Allocated for Professional Staff Salaries	Degree of Integration with Regular Program (0-3)*	Work Experience Component
1	Yes	0	Yes
2	Yes	3	No
3	Yes	3	No
4	Yes	1	Yes
5	Yes	1	Yes
6	Yes	2	Yes
7	Yes	3	No
8	Yes	3	No
9	Yes	0	Yes
10	Yes	1	Yes
11	Yes	2	No
12	Yes	2	No
13	Yes	0	Yes
14	Yes	0	Yes
15	Yes	0	No

*The degree of integration of the E.O.F. project with regular school programs was rated on a four point (0-3) scale from completely segregated (0) to quite highly integrated (i.e. for at least 50% of the pupil time) (3).

2. The interview sample. In Table 2.2, a breakdown of the number of persons interviewed at each site is provided. In total, eighty-three adults and forty-seven students were interviewed. Only at Project #3, where students were not readily identifiable as participants in the E.O.F. project, were no students interviewed. As noted elsewhere, forty-five of the students interviewed also served as the sample for the student case studies. (See Section V of this report.)

Table 2.2

Summary of Sample Interviewed

Project	No. of Adults	No. of Students	Total
1	5	3	8
2	5	3	8
3	2	0	2
4	4	3	7
5	8	3	11
6	6	3	9
7	4	4	8
8	10	4	14
9	6	3	9
10	4	6	10
11	5	3	8
12	6	3	9
13	4	3	7
14	11	3	14
15	3	3	6
Total	83	47	130

3. Judgements on the projects. In Table 2.3, a summary of the judgements made of each project by the external evaluation team is provided. These judgements were made on the basis of the data obtained during the site visits and represent a global evaluation of each project with respect to six categories of performance, as follows: (1) overall results as portrayed by the interview data, (2) evidence from the 1979-80 follow-up data on where students from the first year of the project are, (3) the quality of the pupil

evaluation system as evidenced by material contained in student files, (4) quality of facilities in terms of space, cleanliness, attractiveness, availability of auxiliary facilities such as bathrooms and kitchens, (5) quality of equipment and curriculum materials, and (6) quality of activities in and out of school as represented by observed classroom and work setting behaviors.

Table 2.3

Evaluator's Judgements about Projects

Project	Interviews	1979-80 Follow-up	Pupil Evaluation System	Facilities	Equipment	Activities
1	3	3	3	2	2	3
2	2	0	3	2	3	2
3	2	0	0	3	2	3
4	3	3	2	1	2	2
5	3	2	2	1	2	3
6	3	1	2	2	2	3
7	2	1	3	2	2	1
8	3	0	2	2	2	2
9	3	3	3	2	3	3
10	3	1	2	2	2	2
11	3	1	3	3	3	3
12	3	3	3	3	3	3
13	3	3	3	3	3	3
14	3	2	3	3	3	3
15	3	0	2	3	3	3

Note: The scale for each category was a three-point scale ranging from 1 (low) to 3 (high).

The information in Table 2.3 shows that the great majority of projects visited were judged to be quite effective. Some weaknesses were evident, however, in the 1979-80 follow-up data, in facilities and, in one case, in activities.

4. Main effects of the projects. In Table 2.4, a summary of the main effects of the projects and an indication of which projects achieved a particular effect is provided.

Table 2.4

Summary of Main Effects of Projects

	Effect	Projects Achieving Effects	n (out of 15)
1.	Improved academic performance	1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13	9
2.	Success in work setting	1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13	6
3.	Retention in school	3, 5, 6, 11, 13, 15	6
4.	Improved attendance	1, 4, 10, 12, 14	5
5.	Improved self-concept	1, 3, 4, 9, 10	5
6.	Improved attitude to school	2, 10, 12, 15	4
7.	Improved behavior at home	5, 7, 8, 14	4
8.	Social skills	11, 12, 13, 14	4
9.	Inter-agency communication	8, 14	2
10.	Improved study habits	2, 5	2

The table also shows the number of projects in which a particular effect was reported. In order of their frequency of

occurrence, the most common effects were: (1) improved academic performance, (2) success in the work setting, (3) retention in school, (4) improved attendance, (5) improved self-concept, (6) improved attitude to school, (6) improved behavior at home, and (8) improved social skills.

5. Proposed changes. In Table 2.5, a summary list of proposed changes in project operation or in E.O.F. guidelines and procedures is provided.

Table 2.5

Summary of Proposed Changes

	Change	Projects Proposing Change	n (out of 15)
1.	Expand program	1, 3, 8, 12, 14, 15	6
2.	Control enrolment	1, 2, 10, 11	4
3.	Adjust grant for small districts	3	1
4.	Provide a senior high component	4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14	6
5.	Serve female students	5	1
6.	Provide more information to community	3, 4, 5	3
7.	Provide in-service help for teachers	5, 7, 14	3

Expansion of the program in terms of its ability to serve more students in the local jurisdiction and upward movement to a senior high school component were the two most frequently occurring suggestions.

Results of Province-Wide Survey

A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was administered to persons associated with a randomly selected representative sample of thirty-six projects, as well as to persons associated with the fifteen projects examined in the site visit component of the evaluation study. The results of the survey are provided in this section of the report. It should be noted that the information in all of the tables is presented in terms of the percentage of the sample who made a particular response. The number of usable returns was 362 out of a potential sample of 435. This amounted to an 83.2% rate of return which compares very favourably with the rates of return reported in the research literature on similar evaluation projects.

1. Background information. In Tables 3.1 and 3.2, the two items of background information are summarized.

Table 3.1

Positions Held by Questionnaire Respondents
(Item 1)

Category	%
1. Contact person	14.2
2. Teacher, counsellor, etc.	54.3
3. Employer (work experience program)	9.1
4. Parent	12.2
5. Outside agency (e.g. Social Services)	8.6
6. No response	1.5

Table 3.2

Years Associated with E.O.F. Project
(Item 2)

	Response	%
1.	1979-80	2.5
2.	1980-81	33.5
3.	Both years	61.9
4.	No response	2.0

Table 3.1 shows that the largest group responding to the questionnaire was comprised of teachers and other persons closely associated with the in-school aspects of the program. However, parent and employer groups were reasonably well represented (one out of every five respondents), as were contact persons and members of "outside" agencies. The data in Table 3.2 show that over 60% of the respondents had been associated with the program during both of its first two years of operation and slightly over one-third were associated with it during the current year only.

In Tables 3.3 to 3.15, the results of the analysis of responses to the Likert-type items are given.

2. Achievement of local objectives. The achievement of intended objectives of the project (Table 3.3) was rated as good or excellent by just over 85% of the respondents. No one rated achievement as poor and only 2% saw achievement as being limited.

Table 3.3

Achievement of Local Project Objectives
(Item 3)

Response	%
1. Poor	0.0
2. Limited	2.0
3. Fair	8.1
4. Good	55.8
5. Excellent	29.4
6. No Opinion	4.6

3. Positive side-effects of local projects. The data in Table 3.4 show that respondents had generally positive estimates about the nature of project side-effects.

Table 3.4

Positive Side-Effects of Projects
(Item 4)

Response	%
1. Never	0.5
2. Seldom	1.5
3. Sometimes	18.3
4. Often	61.9
5. Always	13.2
6. No Opinion	4.6

4. Effect upon student attitudes. The effect of the local project upon student attitudes (Table 3.5) was rated as positive or highly positive by 93% of respondents. Practically no group of respondents saw the effect as negative to any degree.

Table 3.5

Effect of the Local Project upon Student Attitudes (Item 5)

Response	%
1. Very Negative	0.5
2. Negative	0.0
3. Neutral	4.6
4. Positive	64.0
5. Highly Positive	28.9
6. No Opinion	2.0

5. Effect upon school work habits. The effect of the project upon work habits in school was rated, as indicated in Table 3.6, as positive or highly positive by 77% of the respondents. Some 13% saw "neutral" effects upon work habits while virtually no one saw the effects as negative.

Table 3.6

Effect of the Local Project upon School Work Habits (Item 6)

Response	%
1. Very Negative	0.0
2. Negative	0.5
3. Neutral	13.2
4. Positive	63.5
5. Highly Positive	14.2
6. No Opinion	8.6

6. Effect upon student self-concept. Approximately 92% of the respondents rated the effect of the project upon student self-concept as positive or highly positive. There was virtually no negative opinion expressed on this issue.

Table 3.7

Effect of the Local Project upon Self-Concept of Students
(Item 7)

Response	%
1. Very Negative	0.0
2. Negative	0.5
3. Neutral	2.5
4. Positive	58.4
5. Highly Positive	33.5
6. No Opinion	5.1

7. Demands on time and energy. The demands of the E.O.F. project upon the time and energy of respondents varied somewhat (Table 3.8). In the range of heavy to extremely heavy, was 39% of the sample. However, 57% reported that the demand had been light, or even very light.

Table 3.8

Demands of Project on Time and Energy
(Item 8)

Response	%
1. Very Light	16.8
2. Light	40.1
3. Heavy	23.4
4. Very Heavy	12.2
5. Extremely Heavy	3.6
6. No Opinion	4.1

8. Community reaction to the project. Community reaction to the project was rated by two-thirds of the respondents (Table 3.9) as positive or highly positive, 12% saw the reaction as neutral, while only 2% rated it as negative.

Table 3.9

Community Reaction to the Local Project
(Item 9)

	Response	%
1.	Very Negative	0.0
2.	Negative	2.0
3.	Neutral	12.7
4.	Positive	49.7
5.	Highly Positive	16.8
6.	No Opinion	18.8

9. Employers' attitudes to the project. The attitudes of employers to the project (Table 3.10) as rated by the respondents to the questionnaire study, were positive according to 69% of the group. An examination of responses provided by the sample of employers revealed that 100% of them were positive or highly positive towards the program.

Table 3.10

Employers' Attitudes to the Local Project
(Item 10)

	Response	%
1.	Very Negative	0.0
2.	Negative	1.0
3.	Neutral	6.6
4.	Positive	47.2
5.	Highly Positive	21.8
6.	No Opinion	23.4

10. Parents' attitudes to the projects. As shown in Table 3.11, parents' attitudes to the local project were, in the opinion of 86% of the respondents, positive or highly positive.

Table 3.11

Parents' Attitudes to the Local Project
(Item 11)

Response	%
1. Very Negative	0.0
2. Negative	0.0
3. Neutral	3.6
4. Positive	52.3
5. Highly Positive	34.0
6. No Opinion	10.2

11. Achievement of provincial objectives. As indicated in Table 3.12, the achievement of provincial E.O.F. objectives was generally rated positively. Only 5% of the respondents reported "limited" or "poor" achievement.

Table 3.12

Rating of Province-Wide Achievement of Objectives
(Item 12)

Response	%
1. Poor	0.5
2. Limited	4.6
3. Fair	13.7
4. Good	48.2
5. Excellent	12.2
6. No Opinion	20.8

12. Administrative requirements. On the question of the administrative requirements associated with the E.O.F. program, there was a fairly wide distribution of responses as indicated in Table 3.13. Almost two-thirds of the respondents reported moderate to very extensive requirements while 10% reported limited or not extensive requirements in terms of administration.

Table 3.13

Administrative Requirements of Provincial E.O.F.
(Item 13)

Response	%
1. Not Extensive	2.5
2. Limited	7.6
3. Moderate	41.6
4. Extensive	20.8
5. Very Extensive	3.0
6. No Opinion	24.4

13. Preferred funding method. In Table 3.14, the responses to the question regarding the preferred method of funding are provided. One half of the respondents said that they would prefer the continuance of special funding; 26.9% preferred inclusion of E.O.F. monies in the Foundation Program Grants, and 22.5% had no opinion on this question.

Table 3.14

Preferred Funding Method for E.O.F.
(Item 16)

Response	%
1. Include in Foundation Program Grants	26.9
2. Continue Special Funding	50.5
3. No Opinion	22.5

14. Opinions on continuation. The answer to the question of continuance of the E.O.F. Junior High component beyond 1982 was a "yes" vote in 94.2% of the cases and a "no" vote in only 2.6% of the cases.

Table 3.15

Opinions on Continuation of E.O.F. Beyond 1982
(Item 17)

Responses	%
1. Yes	94.2
2. No	2.6
3. No Opinion	3.1

A further analysis was carried out in order to determine how persons holding a particular position (as indicated by their response to Item #1) responded to each of Items #3 to #13 inclusive. The results of that analysis are provided below in Tables 3.16 to 3.26. In each table, the percentage of respondents holding a particular position is cross-tabulated with the percentage of respondents giving a particular response on the Likert-scale.

The chi square statistic was calculated for each cross-tabulation and the probability of significance is indicated at the bottom of each table. The results presented in the tables show that a significant (at the .01 level) relationship exists between position held and type of response for all the items except #7 (self-concept), #9 (community reaction) and #12 (provincial objectives).

1. Achievement of local objectives. In Table 3.17, the results show that respondents generally had a positive opinion about achievement of local project objectives. If anything, teachers were a bit more modest in their estimate of degree of success than were, for example, the parent and employer groups.

Table 3.16

Achievement of Local Project Objectives
(Item 3)

Position	Response: Poor 1	2	3	4	Excellent 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0.5	0	9.8	4.1	0
Teacher/Counsellor	0	1.5	5.2	30.9	16.0	1.5
Employer	0	0	0.5	6.7	1.5	0.5
Parent	0	0	0.5	5.7	6.2	0
Outside Agency	0	0	1.5	3.6	1.5	2.1

($p = 0.007$)

2. Positive side-effects of local projects. In Table 3.17, the results show a generally quite positive view. As was true in the data reported above, the teacher group in the sample had a slightly wider spectrum of views about the success of the projects in the sense measured by Item 4.

Table 3.17

Positive Side-Effects of Project
(Item 4)

Position	Response: Never 1	2	3	4	Always 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	3.1	9.8	1.5	0
Teacher/Counsellor	0	0.5	8.8	38.7	5.7	1.5
Employer	0.5	0	3.1	4.1	1.5	0
Parent	0	1.0	1.5	4.6	4.1	1.0
Outside Agency	0	0	1.5	5.7	0	1.5

(p = .0005)

3. Effects upon student attitude. In Table 3.18, a consistently positive opinion about the effects of the local projects upon student attitudes is shown. All groups of respondents leaned towards the positive view, although the teacher group was a bit more favourable in its estimate.

Table 3.18

Effect of the Local Project upon Student Attitudes
(Item 5)

Position	Response: Very Negative 1	2	3	4	Highly Positive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	0.5	8.8	5.2	0
Teacher/Counsellor	0	0	2.6	36.6	15.5	0.5
Employer	0.5	0	0.5	6.7	1.5	0
Parent	0	0	0	6.2	6.2	0
Outside Agency	0	0	1.0	5.7	1.0	1.0

(p = .0064)

4. Effect upon school work habits. In Table 3.19, the pattern of responses is similar to those displayed in the other tables in this series. In the view of all categories of respondents, the local project had a positive effect on school work habits. The employer group was, as might have been expected, a little more likely to have "no opinion" on this question.

Table 3.19

Effect of the Local Project upon School Work Habits
(Item 6)

	Response					
Position	Very Negative 1	2	3	4	Highly Positive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	1.5	10.3	2.6	0
Teacher/Counsellor	0	0.5	7.2	38.1	7.7	1.5
Employer	0	0	0.5	4.1	1.0	3.6
Parent	0	0	2.1	8.2	2.1	0
Outside Agency	0	0	1.5	3.1	1.0	3.1

($p = 0.0000$)

5. Effect upon student self-concept. The analysis in Table 3.20 indicates a highly positive opinion as to the effects of the local project upon self-concept of students. The entirely positive opinion of the parent group, on this question, is noteworthy.

Table 3.20

Effect of the Local Project upon Self-Concept of Students
(Item 7)

Position	Response: Very Negative 1	2	3	4	Very Positive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	0.5	10.3	3.6	0
Teacher/Counsellor	0	0.5	1.0	30.4	21.1	2.1
Employer	0	0	0.5	4.6	2.6	1.5
Parent	0	0	0	7.2	5.2	0
Outside Agency	0	0	0.5	5.7	1.5	1.0

N.S.

6. Demands on time and energy. The questionnaire item asked respondents to report on the demands placed on their time and energy. In Table 3.21, the analysis shows that the teacher group in the sample experienced the full range of demands from "very light" to "extremely heavy"; parents, employers and persons from "other agencies" reported a generally "light" demand, while contact persons reported a generally "heavy" demand.

Table 3.21

Demands of Project on Time and Energy
(Item 8)

Position	Response: Very Light 1	2	3	4	Extremely Heavy 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0.5	5.2	6.7	1.5	0.5	0
Teacher/Counsellor	7.2	18.6	14.9	10.3	3.1	1.0
Employer	2.1	6.7	0.5	0	0	0
Parent	5.2	4.6	0	0.5	0	2.1
Outside Agency	2.1	4.6	1.5	0	0	0.5

($p = 0.0000$)

7. Community reaction to the project. Table 3.22 shows that there was a generally positive estimate about the nature of community reaction to the local projects.

Table 3.22

Community Reaction to the Local Project
(Item 9)

	Response					
Position	Very Negative 1	2	3	4	Highly Positive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	1.5	9.8	1.5	1.5
Teacher/Counsellor	0	2.1	5.7	29.4	8.2	9.8
Employer	0	0	2.1	4.1	1.5	1.5
Parent	0	0	2.1	2.6	4.1	3.6
Outside Agency	0	0	1.5	3.6	1.5	2.1

N.S.

8. Employers' attitudes to the project. In Table 3.23, the data show a generally positive estimate of employers' attitudes to the local projects. The employers group of respondents were able to give an opinion in almost all cases and their estimate was that they and their counterparts had a positive view of the projects. The other categories of respondents were more likely to express "no opinion" and were a little more likely (not significantly, however) to choose the "neutral" response.

Table 3.23

Employers' Attitudes to the Local Project
(Item 10)

Position	Response: Very Negative 1	2	3	4	Highly Positive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	2.1	6.7	2.1	3.6
Teacher/Counsellor	0	0.5	2.1	27.3	13.4	11.9
Employer	0	0	0.5	6.7	1.5	0.5
Parent	0	0	0.5	4.1	3.1	4.6
Outside Agency	0	0.5	1.0	2.6	2.1	2.6

N.S.

9. Parent attitudes to the projects. In Table 3.24, the data show a consistently positive estimate about parental attitudes. The parents were all able to express an opinion on this question.

Table 3.24

Parent Attitudes to the Local Project
(Item 11)

Position	Response: Very Negative 1	2	3	4	Highly Positive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	0	0.5	9.8	3.6	0.5
Teacher/Counsellor	0	0	2.6	27.3	20.6	4.6
Employer	0	0	0	4.1	1.5	3.6
Parent	0	0	0	5.7	6.7	0
Outside Agency	0	0	0.5	5.7	1.5	1.0

($p = 0.0023$)

10. Achievement of provincial objectives. Table 3.25 contains the information on respondents' opinions as to how well the provincial E.O.F. objectives were realized. As might be expected, many of the respondents had no opinion on this question; but there was a generally positive view on this question. The teacher group's responses were, it should be noted, fairly well distributed across the set of possible responses.

Table 3.25

Rating of Province-Wide Achievement of Objectives
(Item 12)

Position	Response					
	Poor 1	2	3	4	Excellent 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0.5	0.5	3.6	8.2	0.5	1.0
Teacher/Counsellor	0	3.6	6.7	26.8	5.7	12.4
Employer	0	0.5	0.5	4.1	1.5	2.6
Parent	0	0	2.1	4.1	3.1	3.1
Outside Agency	0	0	0.5	5.2	1.5	20.6

N.S.

11. Administrative requirements. Item #13 on the questionnaire asked respondents to assess the administrative requirements (e.g., proposals, reports, contracts, evaluations, etc.) of the provincial E.O.F. program. In Table 3.26, the data show that contact persons were more likely to indicate a heavier demand than, say, the teacher group who, mainly, saw the requirements as "moderate."

Table 3.26

Administrative Requirements of Provincial E.O.F.
(Item 13)

Position	Response: Not at all Extensive 1	2	3	4	Very Extensive 5	No Opinion
Contact Person	0	2.1	6.7	5.2	0.5	0
Teacher/Counsellor	1.5	4.1	26.3	7.7	1.5	13.9
Employer	0	1.5	3.1	1.5	0	3.1
Parent	0.5	0	4.1	4.1	1.0	2.6
Outside Agency	0.5	0	1.5	2.1	0	4.6

($p = 0.0119$)

The open-ended questionnaire items (#14, 15, 18) were, as described in an earlier section of this report, dealt with by the method of content analysis. The results of that analysis are presented in Tables 3.27, 3.28 and 3.29 (below).

12. Positive side-effects. Item #14 asked respondents to list up to three (if any) positive side-effects which the E.O.F. program or local project has had in the school, school district, the family, the community, or elsewhere. The list of statements in Table 3.27 was obtained through the content analysis. The "X's" in the table show whether a particular statement was included in the table because it was mentioned frequently by respondents or because it was judged, by the evaluator, to be a particularly salient or striking piece of information. The criterion for use of the "mentioned frequently" label was that twenty or more respondents (approximately 5% of the sample) had mentioned the concept. Saliency was judged in terms of relevance or importance as estimated by the evaluator.

Table 3.27

Positive Side-Effects of the E.O.F. Program
(Item 14)

Effect	Mentioned Frequently	Salient
Increased parent involvement		X
Improved performance in regular classrooms		X
Better parent-child relationships	X	
Increased student self-confidence	X	
Students accept themselves	X	
Increased pride	X	
Opportunity to enter work force	X	
Improved communications between school and other social agencies		X

13. Negative side-effects. In Table 3.28, a format similar to that used in Table 3.27 is used to show the negative side-effects identified in response to Item #15. Some rather interesting ideas emerged from this particular analysis. While only six problem areas were identifiable, each of them seems important from a provincial policy standpoint.

Table 3.28

Negative Side-Effects of the E.O.F. Program
(Item 15)

Effect	Mentioned Frequently	Salient
Some students capable of handling the regular program are seeing the E.O.F. project as the easy way out	X	
Students become labelled	X	
It is essentially a terminal program	X	
Takes up teacher time for very few students	X	
Too much time spent travelling on busses	X	
Removing students from regular programs reduces incentive for teachers to differentiate the program	X	

14. Proposed changes. Item #18 asked respondents to list desired, wanted changes in the regulations and/or procedures used in the E.O.F. provincial program. The suggestions are very much in harmony with the suggestions obtained during the site visit interviews and, in effect, provide strong corroboration for the validity of that information.

Table 3.29

Proposed Changes in E.O.F. Procedures and Regulations
(Item 18)

Change	Mentioned Frequently	Salient
Increased per pupil grant	X	
Continue the program into senior high	X	
More in-service for E.O.F. teachers	X	
More exchanges of information and materials	X	
Simplify written proposal	X	
Coordinate with high school program	X	

Achievement Test Results

The full description of the achievement test portion of the study is provided in Appendix C. In this section of the report, only overall summary results are provided.

In Tables 4.1 and 4.2, a comparison of the E.O.F. project results with the provincial norms obtained during the MACOSA project is provided. The data in the tables provided in this section and in the Appendix indicate that:

Reading Test

1. Students in the E.O.F. projects generally performed at less than the provincial average.

2. Within particular projects, there was a considerable range in the degree of success on the reading test. The percentages

Table 4.1

Comparison of Project Results in Reading with MACOSA Results

Project	Number	% Correct Project	% Correct MACOSA	Difference
1	14	64.7	63.8	+ 0.9
2	13	43.4	63.8	-20.3
3	11	54.5	63.8	- 9.2
4	7	56.3	63.8	- 7.4
5	14	52.6	63.8	-11.1
6	11	52.2	63.8	-11.6
7	15	62.5	63.8	- 1.3
8	7	41.8	63.8	-22.0
9	11	52.9	63.8	-10.9
Total E.O.F. Sample	103	61.9(Avg.)	63.8(Avg.)	- 1.9

Table 4.2

Comparison of Project Results in Mathematics with MACOSA Results

Project	Number	% Correct Project	% Correct MACOSA	Difference
1	14	60.8	66.1	- 5.3
2	13	51.5	66.1	-14.6
3	11	55.2	66.1	-10.1
4	7	67.5	66.1	+ 1.4
5	14	53.4	66.1	-12.6
6	9	62.1	66.1	- 4.0
7	16	55.6	66.1	-10.5
8	7	65.0	66.1	- 1.1
9	12	57.2	66.1	- 8.9
Total Sample	103	57.6(Avg.)	66.1(Avg.)	- 8.4

of students who were above the MACOSA average were 50%, 15%, 18%, 28%, 35%, 36%, 53%, 14%, and 27% in the nine projects.

3. When all of the E.O.F. project test scores were pooled, the difference between the E.O.F. group and the MACOSA provincial average was 1.9 percentage points (favoring the MACOSA sample).

Mathematics Test

4. Students in the E.O.F. projects generally performed below the provincial average in mathematics.

5. Within projects, the range of performance levels was quite high. The percentages of students who were above the MACOSA average were 28%, 23%, 27%, 57%, 70%, 44%, 12%, 57%, 25%.

6. The pooled E.O.F. test scores in mathematics were 8.4 percentage points below the MACOSA average (57.6% for the E.O.F. sample as compared with 66.1% for the MACOSA sample).

Note: It should be noted that the Grade VI MACOSA tests had been administered to pupils at the Grade 7-9 level.

Student Case Studies

The results of the content analysis of the information obtained on the Report Form on Students are summarized in this section. The summary Table 5.1 provides the set of judgements, by the external evaluator, as to whether a particular student had benefitted (+), remained the same as at entry to the project (±), or suffered some loss (-) during the time period under review.

Also provided in the table is a brief statement describing the type or area of change in the students as described by the persons who completed the Report Form.

Table 5.1

Summary of Student Case Studies

Student No.	Judgement	Type of Change
1	+	Improved self-confidence.
2	+	Emotional maturation.
3	+	Re-entered academic stream.
4	±	Improved academic skills
5	+	Attitude toward school.
6	+	Improved self-concept.
7	+	Returning to regular class 4/5 in 81-82.
8	±	Has remained in school.
9	±	Improved over short-term only.
10	±	Improved over short-term only.
11	±	Improved over short-term only.
12	+	Improved when back at home school.
13	+	Attendance and work habits.
14	+	Increased self confidence.
15	+	In-class behavior improved.
16	+	Improved social skills.
17	+	Improved self-image.
18	-	Relapse.
19	+	Still attending school.
20	-	Behavior worsened.
21	+	Holding a job.
22	+	Improved attendance by 75%.
23	+	Returned to academic stream.

Table 5.1 (continued)

Student No.	Judgement	Type of Change
24	+	Returned to academic stream.
25	+	Behavior and attendance improved.
26	+	Improved effort and social behavior.
27	+	Improved reading performance.
28	+	Classroom behavior is better.
29	±	Short-term improvement, then regression.
30	-	In juvenile detention center.
31	+	Improved in all aspects of schooling.
32	+	Maturing socially.
33	+	Improved attitude and academic work.
34	+	Has become a first-class employee.
35	+	Improved human skills.
36	+	Genuine "day into night" change.
37	+	Improved family relationships.
38	+	Without the program, he would have been institutionalized (psychiatrist's report).

Because of the nature of one of the site visit projects, it was not appropriate to select three students in that project; therefore, the total sample of case studies was 42. Reports were obtained on 38 students out of the total possible sample of 42 for a 90% rate of return. In each case, at least two adults had provided the Report Form information and in a majority of cases, there was supplementary information in the form of employer's evaluations of work experience, letters from teachers and administrators, and test results.

The data in Table 5.1 show that the types of change reported were quite similar to those reported in the province-wide survey as well as those indicated during the site visit interviews and that, in general, they reflected the full range of project objectives as described in the original project proposals and, also, observed at the site visit projects.

In the table, only three of the case studies on students were judged to be indicative of a deterioration during the time period under review; in six other cases, a neutral (±) judgement was made because the reports showed that the students had benefitted during the early stages of their involvement in an E.O.F. project; but had later deteriorated or returned to some "negative" status. Overall, however, twenty-nine of the cases were judged to be positive. Given that this was a randomly selected group of students representing fourteen projects which themselves are claimed to be representative of the total population of E.O.F. (Jr. High) projects, the high percentage (76%) of cases in which positive results had been reported and the strong congruence between the "types of change"

and E.O.F. policy statements suggest that these findings are quite significant from a practical standpoint.

Some Areas for Further Study

During the site visits and later during the preparation of this report, the evaluator formed opinions about a number of issues associated with the E.O.F. (Jr. High) program. These opinions stemmed from concerns and questions about which the evaluation team had begun to develop some tentative hypotheses, but for which no systematic collection of data could be established during the course of this project. The data base for these opinions and concerns is, therefore, quite skimpy, stemming, as it did, from striking (but infrequent) comments by E.O.F. project staff, or from the hunches and observations of the evaluation team, or gleaned from reading between the lines of project documents, interview transcripts and open-ended questionnaire responses. The evaluator is prepared to put these opinions and concerns forward in the report as suggested areas for further study rather than as part of the results or conclusions. In the paragraphs that follow, the questions for further study and the evaluator's comments on these questions are presented.

1. Teacher recruitment, training and retention. The evaluator is concerned about possible problems of teacher "burnout" in programs of the type studied here. While the group of teachers and other professionals now associated with E.O.F. are, in the evaluator's opinion, an elite group of very special individuals, there were some signs that a number of them do not want to remain in the E.O.F. (Jr.

High) setting for too much longer. The energy and psychic drain produced by working with high-risk students in settings that do not always provide a full range of professional support services may, eventually, take its toll. Unless some attention is given to pre-service and in-service education of teachers for such projects and unless a full discussion of the problems of recruitment and retention takes place, there may be a significant shortage of teachers needed to operate programs of this nature.

2. The re-entry problem. A critical problem may exist regarding the re-entry of E.O.F. students to "regular" educational streams at the senior high level and beyond. If the program is to have long-term educational benefits then it seems desirable to study, over a longer time span, ways of providing programs for E.O.F. "graduates."

3. Long-term effects of the program. If ever an opportunity for a longitudinal study of a special category of Alberta school students existed, it surely does with the E.O.F. program. The evaluator was forever at a loss in attempts to assess the long-term benefits of the program and the projects. The number of students involved in the projects is likely to be such that a longitudinal study could be managed, on a sample basis, for fairly reasonable costs. For example, extrapolating from an average of twelve students per project in the "typical" projects described here, the total population of E.O.F. students for 1980-81 was approximately 1,680 (140 projects x 12 students per project). A cohort of 400

students could be randomly selected for a longitudinal study that would enable policy makers as well as practitioners to obtain better knowledge about the effects of such programs.

4. The regular junior high program. Woven among the three areas for study already mentioned above is the question of whether E.O.F. special programming is really necessary. Perhaps the question should read: Would E.O.F. programming be necessary in a well-functioning junior high school system? Put another way, the question is: Under what conditions or with what reforms could the regular system deal with the students for whom the E.O.F. program seems to work?

In any case, consideration might be given to a study of teacher preparation programs for junior high, curriculum content and organization and other related topics.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions are presented with direct reference to the evaluation questions listed in Section I. For each conclusion, an attempt is made to show how evidence drawn from the various sources of data bears upon the particular question. A discussion of the conclusions is also provided in an effort to place the conclusions of this particular study against the larger background of research and development which was obtained from the review of the literature.

The headings used here are drawn directly from the two general evaluation questions in Section I.

1. Effectiveness and Appropriateness of the E.O.F. (Jr. High) Provincial Program

a. Overall purposes and rationale. The program was conceived of as meeting the needs of a group of target pupils who, according to the Hathaway and Rhodes (1979) review, were very likely to be found within Alberta school districts. Moreover, on the basis of information about programs in other places, there was a strong probability that effective programs could be mounted to meet the needs of such target pupils. Three main objectives in the academic, work and social skill areas were identified for the E.O.F. component. The evidence from the document analysis, the province-wide survey, the site visits and the student case studies is all very clearly in support of the fact that an extensive population of target pupils exists in all jurisdictions in the province. In fact, in many jurisdictions, the need for such programming far exceeds the resources provided in these first three years of implementation. Secondly, all sources of data indicate that

school jurisdictions, given provincial funding, have been able to design and implement programs which, in the short term at least, are having positive effects upon students. Finally, although there was wide-spread opinion that projects are having positive effects upon academic achievement (see the site visit summary), the evidence from the achievement test study shows that levels of performance in reading and mathematics are not strong. This suggests that of the three general policy objectives, the one on academic achievement must be interpreted carefully. That is, gradual improvement in academic performance, rather than complete congruence with general norms of performance, should be the goal. In the other two areas for which policy objectives were established, the document analysis, the site visits, the student case studies and the province-wide survey all combine to support a conclusion that these objectives are being achieved in large measure.

Therefore, it can be concluded that:

1. *The E.O.F. (Jr. High) program is both effective and appropriate in terms of its overall purposes and rationale. However, the goal of academic improvement must be carefully interpreted so that, indeed, functional levels are expected as an outcome of the program.*

b. Provincial policies, regulations and guidelines. Evidence from the province-wide survey and the site visits, as well as some information obtained in the analysis of files, suggest that the policies, regulations and guidelines are both appropriate and effective. However, at the policy level, there was a fairly strong opinion that consideration should be given to expanding the funding

to accommodate larger numbers of students in many of the jurisdictions and a very strong opinion that some similar programs be developed in the senior high schools. There was no indication, from any of our data sources, that the guidelines or regulations placed unnecessarily heavy demands, in terms of "red tape," upon local staff, although developing, implementing and reporting on proposals was a fairly significant work-load factor for many people. Therefore, it can be concluded that:

2. *The present E.O.F. (Jr. High) policies, regulations and procedures have been effective.*

c. Activities of the E.O.F. office. The sources of data pertaining to this question were the file analysis study, the site visits, and the province-wide study. There were no pieces of evidence contrary to a positive conclusion on this question and, in fact, there were numerous indications that the office had served the needs and interests of both Alberta Education and the local jurisdictions and their staff and students. Therefore, it is concluded that:

3. *The E.O.F. office played an important role in the development, implementation and monitoring of the E.O.F. (Jr. High) component.*

d. Activities of Alberta Education Regional Offices. Evidence on this question was collected mainly through the site visit interviews and, indirectly, through examination of memos, monitoring reports and other materials contained in project files. It was clear that the level of involvement varied with the need, on the part of jurisdictions, for outside assistance. Districts that had a

well-elaborated administrative and supervisory system had little need for help other than that available directly through the E.O.F. office in Edmonton. However, when help was needed, it was obviously well provided. Therefore, it can be concluded that:

5. *The Regional Offices of Alberta Education provided assistance, as requested by local jurisdictions, in the development and implementation of E.O.F. (Jr. High) projects.*

2. Effectiveness of the Projects

a. Project rationale and objectives. The two chief sources of data on this question were the analysis of proposals and the site visits. Together, these two sources provided information as to what the rationale and objectives were at the time of approval of the funding and as to how they had evolved during the 1979-81 time period. As indicated in the report of results of the document analysis and in the descriptions of the site visit projects, the rationale and objectives were very much in harmony with the objectives outlined in the E.O.F. policy statement and in the judgement of the evaluation team were very much in tune with the needs of the target pupils. Clearly, the policy was translated into a set of project objectives which, although tailored to fit special local needs and conditions, remained compatible with the broad general goals identified by the province.

Therefore, it is concluded that:

5. *The rationale and objectives of the projects were effective and appropriate.*

b. Planning activities and proposals. The document analysis, the information obtained during the site visits, as well as the "informal" observations and impressions of the evaluation team all point toward a conclusion that proposal development and planning were reasonably well done especially given the small amount of lead time that project developers had available. In some cases, the projects were, perhaps, not as well conceived of as they might have been; but there is no way of determining what an alternative situation, in terms of the lead time available, would have produced. Therefore, on the basis of the various pieces of evidence available, it is concluded that:

6. *The quality of planning and proposal development activities was acceptable.*

c. Project implementation. The sources of data on implementation were the site visits, the province-wide survey, the student case study, the achievement test study, as well as some of the materials contained in project files in the E.O.F. Office. All of the evidence points to a conclusion that, with appropriate modifications in some instances, the projects were implemented as planned. The external evaluation team, during the site visits, was satisfied that the allocated funds were being used as intended. Therefore, the conclusion is that:

7. *The projects have been implemented in accordance with project plans and proposals.*

d. Effectiveness of projects. The site visit data, the province-wide survey, the student case studies, and the achievement

test data were the data sources on this question. When the concrete results shown in the student case studies are correlated with the results of the province-wide survey and the site visits, there is strong evidence for the following conclusion:

8. *The local projects have been highly effective in achieving their intended objectives.*

Discussion of the Conclusions

In the bibliography appended to this report, a number of important generalizations, drawn from similar programs, can be found. They will provide a background against which the conclusions of this study can be discussed.

Results of the literature review. Users of this report should note that the Kern et al. (1979) item in the bibliography is a review of the literature on compensatory education. Although it was prepared as a background document for program development in the State of Florida, its contents would likely be of interest to program developers in Alberta. Therefore, the evaluator recommends it highly as an important resource for E.O.F. program and project staff. In the Kern review, for example, a number of characteristics which were found to be common to successful compensatory programs were identified. The characteristics were:

1. Systematic planning had been undertaken before projects and programs were implemented.

2. Strong leadership was provided by administrators at both the school and district office levels.

3. Appropriate teacher training had been provided.

4. Teachers in the program were skilled in diagnosis, curriculum development and in classroom management and teaching.

5. The "model" of teaching which seemed most effective was the so-called "direct" teaching approach.

In a provocative study conducted by Abt and Associates (Barclay et al., 1979), serious questions were raised about the relationship between employment rates and secondary school drop-out rates. The main point of their research was that school programs which have as an explicit objective the development of work skills such as those supposedly learned in work experience programs are, in fact, increasing the likelihood that students who successfully acquire such skills will drop out of school at an early age. The American data on this question were quite strongly supportive of the hypothesis that work-related school programs are predictive of early drop-out. What might be useful in Alberta would be to obtain data, possibly through a longitudinal study of E.O.F. students and a suitable comparison group, in order to find Canadian answers to the questions posed by the Abt group.

On the question of appropriate criteria for successful performance of compensatory programs, a number of researchers have provided some useful comments. For example, Forgione et al. (1979) argued that many evaluation strategies have been flawed in at least two ways: (1) too high a priority has been assigned to system (i.e., state or nation) wide achievement testing, and (2) the evaluation work has been unrelated to program design and change. That is,

accountability rather than program improvement was the main criterion for evaluation project design. In the E.O.F. program, the results reported in the achievement testing study and the fact that a number of the site-visit projects were not dealing directly with academic areas such as reading or mathematics is interesting in terms of the first point noted by Forgione and his colleagues. Perhaps more interesting is the argument made for inclusion of instructional process studies in any future evaluation projects. In the E.O.F. study, such data were collected at several of the sites.

The description of the site visits and the information gleaned by the evaluator from the document analysis study indicated clearly that no single best approach to project design and implementation was observable in Alberta. There was a good deal of variation in the projects and, perhaps unfortunately, there was no clearly emerging set of standard successful characteristics. This fact brings to mind the concept of "planned variation" which receives much attention in the literature (see, for example, Melargo, 1978; Stebbins, 1976).

The concept of planned variation is based on three key assumptions:

1. There is no "state of the art" one best design for compensatory programs.

2. There are, however, a number of specifiable alternative models for compensatory education which can be developed and elaborated upon sufficiently well to serve as operational plans for school-based implementation.

3. If school jurisdictions could be persuaded to adopt and

implement the various models, a valuable opportunity for educational experimentation would be created.

In the U.S. experience with the planned variation strategy, a number of different models (e.g., 22 different models for programs in one planned variation program) have been developed. One might conjecture about the effectiveness of such a strategy in Alberta, where, for example, a number of soundly based models (including the related curriculum materials) for E.O.F. programs might be developed provincially and made available as optional models for local projects.

One of the recurring issues appearing in the literature reviewed was that of how best to conduct local, internal evaluations. A valuable paper by Forbes (1977) argues the case for central authorities to provide ready-to-use evaluation techniques for possible use by local districts. He makes the point that some recent developments in the field of achievement testing, such as those made by Rasch and his colleagues, have promise for local districts. The new approaches enable local staff to obtain achievement test data which are relevant to their needs for program improvement and individual pupil diagnosis, while at the same time satisfying the accountability requirements of funding agencies. Given Alberta Education's recent development of a pupil evaluation unit, there may well be some opportunities for work along the lines suggested by Forbes.

A paper summing up the policy issues surrounding compensatory education programs (Hill-Scott and Grigsby, 1979) offers the following suggestions about program implementation:

1. The goals of projects should be connected in a systematic way. Otherwise, what appears to be a hodge-podge of projects and programs may develop.

2. Program planners will have to move toward tightly organized programs with achievable operational goals. These goals should be tied to program process and to the curriculum, not just student outcomes in areas of academic achievement.

3. Programs must respond to the notion that parents know what they want a child to learn.

4. Compensatory education must respond to, but not be led by, the mood of the public. It must be coupled with a strong campaign against illiteracy and incompetence so that the public can be convinced that educating the disadvantaged does serve the public and benefit society.

Some of the points emerging from the literature review were:

1. Planned variation as a strategy for implementation has potential for students such as those served by E.O.F.

2. There are somewhat complex interactions of E.O.F. type programs with environmental factors such as employment rates in the province. These should be examined at some point.

3. Systematic planning characterizes successful programs and projects.

4. Central authorities can and should provide help in curriculum development and in methods for local evaluation.

5. Teacher effectiveness is a critical area of concern for programs similar to the E.O.F. program.

6. Evaluation strategies and program objectives should not rely too exclusively on achievement test scores and other "product" measures; but should include data which would be useful in guiding program development and improvement.

Against a background of these arguments and tentative findings from the literature review, the conclusions of this study can be, again, considered. In reconsidering the conclusions, one should keep in mind as well the four areas for further study outlined earlier in the report (i.e., the study of teacher recruitment, training and retention; the re-entry study; the long-term effects study; the examination of the "regular" junior high program).

The program as it is now operating is, according to our conclusions, achieving its provincial and local project objectives. What bears examination, however, is the set of original objectives contained in the E.O.F. policy statement and translated into local action through individual projects. The assumption that projects would be effective in several areas of student learning may need to be reexamined in the light of experience elsewhere. That is, the projects and the program might have performed better had they been focussed on a single goal (such as improvement in reading skills) rather than upon a whole host of goals including academic, affective, and work and life skills. An alternative strategy to the one used in Alberta would assume that a more narrowly defined set of objectives could be used by local project designers. In other words, variation in terms of objectives could be "permitted" and, possibly, planned.

While our conclusions were that the E.O.F. office and other

provincial authorities played an important and useful role in the program, there were some fairly obvious concerns in the field about the need for help in curriculum development and in the area of teacher training and retention. The evaluator is convinced, as noted in an earlier section of the report, that if E.O.F. continues there will be a teacher recruitment problem sometime in the next three to five years. Moreover, there is an evident need for work on the part of teacher education institutions to provide, on a broad basis, the type of preparation that teachers in E.O.F. settings must have. There appears also, given the small amount of direct funding allocated to internal evaluation, to be an urgency, on the part of Alberta Education, to provide increased assistance in that area. Reading the American studies, one is struck by the large amounts of money allocated, over the years, to evaluation as well as to developmental activities. This report itself reflects some measure of concern about and support for evaluation by Alberta Education. However, evaluation strategies that would meet provincial requirements for accountability and, at the same time, provide information for program improvement have not yet been well established in Alberta.

Perhaps the findings reported in Table 3.28 (negative side-effects of the program) will serve as an illustration of the dilemmas facing policy makers, developers, and implementers. One sees, in the list of "negative" side-effects, that a system of "trade-offs" is at work in the E.O.F. program. That is, in order to deal with the target students one is forced in some way to label and to segregate them. In so doing, one runs the risk of attracting students who are

only marginally in need, who become labelled, whose school careers will terminate soon, and so on. It is not that the negative side-effect statements by our questionnaire respondents were irrelevant or unimportant; but that they reflect the contradictions (i.e., trade-offs) inherent in special programing. In some ways, however, the negative opinions might have been unfair in that they are somewhat equivalent to saying about a hospital that it labels patients in some ways, restricts their freedom of movement, attracts some hypochondriacs, and uses up the time of nurses, doctors and other professionals. As far as the conclusions of this study are concerned, the point is that Alberta Education, school district personnel and a number of other agencies (e.g., the universities and the Alberta Teachers' Association) should continue to study and evaluate the E.O.F. (Jr. High) program in terms of big issues and in terms of the possible long-term effects of the program upon students, teachers, programs, and society at large.

Perhaps the most noteworthy link between the conclusions of this study and the material uncovered in the literature search is with respect to the concept of planned variation. Our assessment is that the E.O.F. program permitted and, indeed, encouraged local variation; but that the possibility of capitalizing on the E.O.F. program as a way of providing strong, well-developed model programs and, also, as a way of engaging in significant educational experimentation has not been used to any extent.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The external evaluator recommends to Alberta Education that:

1. The E.O.F. Junior High program should be continued.

2. The E.O.F. Coordinator's Office should continue to administer the E.O.F. program.

3. Consideration should be given to developing a policy which would provide a program with similar objectives at the senior high school level.

4. Studies should be undertaken of: (a) recruitment, training and retention of teachers for E.O.F. programs, (b) the long-term effects of such programs, (c) the implications of E.O.F. programs for regular junior high programs, and (d) the nature of effective teaching in E.O.F. classrooms.

5. Consideration should be given to development of a planned variation strategy for future E.O.F. program development and implementation.

Concluding Statement

The information contained in this report was drawn from a fairly large number of different sources. In several places the evaluator attempted to link the results and conclusions with information drawn from the relevant research literature and, as well, to reflect briefly upon some of the implications of the study. In a sense, the recommendations are the product of the information processing that the evaluator went through as the final draft of the report was being written. The evaluator hopes that the information will be useful and

that the effects of this study will be most directly and most positively felt by the students of the type encountered during the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelow, David and Novak, Carl D. A study of the practical implications of the new Title I reporting and evaluation system. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 160 613, 1978.

Anderson, Janice K. et al. The U.S. office of education models to evaluate E.S.E.A. Title I: Experiences after one year of use. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 163 105, 1978.

Anderson, Judith I. et al. The use of Title I evaluation data in local decision-making—A federal perspective. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 177 218, 1979.

Barclay, Suzanne et al. Employment and schooling as complements and substitutes: Results for 16-19 year old youths from low-income households. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 181 302, 1979.

Barnes, Robert E. and Ginsburg, Alan L. Relevance of the RMC models for Title I policy concerns. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1 (March-April 1979), 7-14.

Bredderman, Ted. Elementary school process curricula—A meta-analysis. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 170 333, 1978.

Bruno, Lee. Intake and assessment: Comprehensive employment and training act program models. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 159 407, 1978.

Burkheimer, Graham J. Evaluation of the upward bound program: A first follow-up. Final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 148 891, 1977.

Campbell, Donald T. and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Rand-McNally, 1963.

Carrillo, Federico Gartinez (ed.). Approaches to assessing bilingual/bicultural programs. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 169 189, 1979.

Coles, Gary J. Quality control issues in the implementation of the RMC Title I models. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 177 217, 1979.

_____. The evaluation of the ESEA Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education program: Research design and analytic approaches. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 164 606, 1978.

Cooley, William W. et al. How to identify effective teaching. Anthropology and education quarterly, 8 (May 1977), 119-126.

Cordray, D. S. and Staneski, R. A. A model for testing rival hypotheses in longitudinal social problems. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 144 966, 1976.

Coulson, John E. National evaluation of the emergency school aid act: A review of methodological issues. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978). 1-60.

Coulson, John E. and Cromer, Fred E. Response to commentary on national evaluation of the emergency school aid act: A review of methodological issues. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 107-118.

Crane, Laura R. and Cech, Joseph. Title I evaluation models A1 and B1: An empirical comparison. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 171 789, 1979.

Cross, Christopher T. Title I evaluation—A case study in congressional frustration. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1 (March-April 1979), 15-21.

Crowe, Michael R. and Adams, Kay A. The current status of assessing experiential education programs. Information series no. 163. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 173 562, 1979.

Curtis, Jonathan et al. When is a LESA (limited English speaking ability) student no longer LESA? ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 179 601, 1979.

Datta, Lois-Ellin. Interpreting data: A case study from the career intern program evaluation. Evaluation review, 4(4) (August 1980), 481-506.

DiCostanzo, James L. Implications of an alternative social reform paradigm for educational evaluation. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 161 916, 1978.

Duck, Gary A. Planned variations study, Vol. V: Student performance measures for evaluating secondary and postsecondary intervention programs. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 154, 674, 1978.

Educational Testing Service. Assessment in a pluralistic society. Proceedings of the ETS invitational conference on testing problems, New York, 1972.. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 150 189, 1973.

Edwards, Roger H. and Bridewell, Joy L. Following through on follow through. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 178 611, 1979.

Estes, Gary D. Estimating gains and establishing program objectives using data from nationally normed tests. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 174 681, 1979.

Estes, Gary D. and Anderson, Judith I. Observed treatment effects with special regression evaluation models in groups with no treatment. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 164 601, 1978.

Faddis, Bonnie J. et al. An empirical comparison of ESEA Title I evaluation models A and B.

Fennessey, James. Blending evidence, technique, and judgment in educational research inference. Final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 143 675, 1976.

Feshbach, Seymour. The illusory control group in field research: Comments on the ESAA evaluation. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 87-93.

Fish, Owen J. An analysis of the evaluation data when ESEA, Title I evaluation models A1 and A2 are empirically field tested simultaneously. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 170 358, 1979.

Follins, Johnnie R. Diagnostic targeted assistance: A process to assess qualitative and quantitative involvement of parents in the Clark College home-school partnership model. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 171 754, 1979.

Forbes, Zean W. Adapting Title I evaluation to local district needs. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 150 199, 1977.

Forgione, Pascal D. et al. Evaluation of compensatory education programs: Problems, promising strategies and recent trends. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 175 933, 1979.

Frechtling, Joy A. and Nyitrary, Gargot S. The structure and content of compensatory education programs: A research strategy for evaluating Title I's effects on services and effects on students. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 137 373, 1977.

Geiser, Kenneth R. A feasibility assessment of the study of follow through parent and teacher effects. Final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 157 917, 1976.

Hafen, Susan and DeGrey, Gwen-Ellen. Evaluating resources for disadvantaged students. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 174 767, 1979.

Haney, Walt. The follow-through planned variation experiment, Vol. V: A technical history of the national follow through evaluation. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152 426, 1977.

Hansen, Joe B. Quality control in Title I evaluation: Problem and approaches. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 155 193, 1977.

Hansen, Joe B. and Oxford, Rebecca L. Effects of the Title I evaluation and reporting system: TAC (technical assistance centre) perspective. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 179 553, 1979.

Hathaway, Warren E. and Rhodes, H. Clarence. Disadvantaged learners: The nature of the problem and some potential solutions. Alberta Education, 1979.

Hick, Thomas L. and Irvine, David J. An analysis of the historical regression method of predicting posttest grade equivalents for categorically-aided programs. Multiple linear regression viewpoints, 8 (June 1978), 18-25.

Hill-Scott, Karen and Grigsby, J. Eugene. Some policy recommendations for compensatory education. Phi delta kappan, 60 (February 1979), 443-446.

Hiscox, Suzanne B. and Owen, Thomas R. Behind the basic assumption of model A. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 166 258, 1978.

Hiscox, Suzanne B. and Williams, Barbara I. When you don't plan to be there long: Evaluating Title I mastery learning programs. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 177 206, 1979.

Hodges, Walter L. and Sheehan, Robert. Ten years of evaluation efforts: The work of follow through sponsors. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 154 937, 1978.

Hope Associates, Inc. Performance review of USOE's ESEA Title I evaluation technical assistance program. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 173 508, 1979.

House, Ernest R. Evaluation as scientific management in U.S. school reform. Comparative education review, 22 (October 1978), 388-401.

Hubert, John Al. A review of the ESEA Title I evaluation and reporting system. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 167 608, 1978.

Jaeger, Richard M. The effect of test selection on Title I project impact. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1 (March-April 1979), 33-40.

Kaplan, Carol B. and Preli, Barbara. Project EPIC (educational preparation for involvement in careers). Jefferson County public schools, Louisville, Kentucky. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 162 105, 1978.

Kern, Alexander et al. Compensatory education: Literature review. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 177 596, 1979.

Lambert, Roger H. and Nelson, Eugene S. A guide to evaluating CETA (comprehensive employment and training act) Title I programs. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 151 556, 1975.

Leinhardt, Gaea. Program evaluation: An empirical study of individualized instruction. American educational research journal, 14 (Summer 1977), 277-293.

Linn, Robert L. Validity of inference based on the proposed Title I evaluation models. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1 (March-April 1979), 23-32.

Long, John et al. An empirical investigation of the ESEA Title I evaluation systems' proposed variance estimation procedures for use with criterion referenced tests. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 161 914, 1978.

Loveridge, Robert L. and Carapella, Ruth. The application of USOE models A, B, C, to a Title I early childhood program. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 173 440, 1979.

MacKay, A. An evaluation of the educational opportunities fund. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1975.

McLaughlin, Donald H. Title I: 1965-1975: A synthesis of the findings of federal studies. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 145 010, 1977.

McLaughlin, Donald H. et al. Controversies in the evaluation of compensatory education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 145 011, 1977.

Melargo, Ralph et al. Planned variations study: Vol 1, Executive summary. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 154 670, 1978.

Mirkin, Phyllis K. and Higgins, Paul S. Title I neglected and delinquent programs in Minneapolis: A critique of the present evaluation requirements and a proposal for future evaluations. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 147 933, 1976.

Monoghan, Anne Coolidge. A consideration of the feasibility of a national study of the impact of follow through on the public school system. Final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 157 914, 1976.

Murray, Steve et al. Title I technical issues as threats to internal validity of experimental and quasiexperimental design. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 175 945, 1979.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Special report on mandated studies. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 173 483, 1979.

National Institute of Education. The compensatory education study: Executive summary. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 160 692, 1978.

_____. Compensatory education study. Final report to congress from the N.I.E. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 161 966, 1978.

New York State Education Department. District evaluator's handbook of selected evaluation procedures. Reprint 1976. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 143 679, 1976.

Peck, Hugh I. Annual evaluation report for the exemplary project in career development, 1975. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152 780, 1975.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. Competing evaluation models: The ESAA evaluation. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 99-106.

Policy Research Corp. District survey I. Policy research corporation analyses. Final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 181 086, 1978.

Powell, George et al. The equipercentile assumption as a pseudo-control group estimate of gain. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 174 673, 1979.

Proper, Elizabeth C. et al. Education as experimentation: A planned variation model. Vol. IV-E, Supplementary analyses: Reanalysis of selected data sets. Vol. IV-F, Supplementary analyses: Appendix. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 148 493, 1977.

Reichardt, Charles S. and Rindskopf, David H. Randomization and educational evaluation: The ESAA evaluation. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 61-68.

Reschly, Daniel J. Nonbiased assessment and school psychology. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 157 240, 1978.

Revicki, Dennis et al. Multivariate analysis of child achievement data in the parent-education follow through program. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 175 901, 1979.

Rogosa, David. Politics, process, and pyramids. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 79-86.

Rossi, Robert J. et al. Summaries of major Title I evaluations, 1966-1976. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 145 012, 1977.

Schmutte, Gregory T. Implementing random assignment: An evaluation design for a youth employment and training project. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 178 802, 1979.

Shiban, John R. Planned variations study. Vol IV: Field implementation plan for a field randomized experiment. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 154 673, 1978.

Stake, Robert E. (ed.). Case studies in the evaluation of educational programmes. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152 786, 1974.

Stanford Research Institute. Longitudinal evaluation of selected features of the national follow through program. Appendix B: Parent interview survey, 1979-80. Draft. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 144 984, 1971.

Stebbins, Linda B. et al. Education as experimentation: A planned variation model. Volume IIIA: Findings: Cohort 2 interim findings: Cohort 3. Volume IIIB: Appendices. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 148 489, 1976.

_____. Education as experimentation: A planned variation model. Volume IVA: An evaluation of follow through. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 148 490, 1977.

Strand, Theresa et al. Exploratory study of the use of a wide range reading test with Model A in Title I evaluation. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 177 201, 1979.

_____. Who said what about Title I evaluation at the AERA/NCME annual meeting, Toronto, March, 1978: Summaries of selected papers. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 177 207, 1978.

Tafoya, Dennis W. and Combs, Boyd G. Robeson County compensatory Indian education project: Project evaluation and final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 161 605, 1978;

Wargo, Michael J. and Green, Donald Ross (ed.). Achievement testing of disadvantaged and minority students for educational program evaluation. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 170 380, 1977.

Weinberg, Meyer. ESAA: Digging deeper into finances. Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 95-98.

Weisberg, Herbert I. How much does ESAA really accelerate academic growth? Journal of educational statistics, 3 (Spring 1978), 69-78.

Weisberg, Herbert I. and Haney, Walt. Longitudinal evaluation of head start planned variation and follow through. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 157 918, 1977.

Wiley, David E. Evaluation by aggregation: Social and methodological biases. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1 (March-April 1979), 41-45.

Wircenski, Jerry L. (comp.). Handbook for the identification and assessment of disadvantaged learners. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 177 344, undated.

Wisler, Carl E. and Anderson, Janice K. Designing a Title I evaluation system to meet legislative requirements. Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 1 (March-April 1979), 47-55.

Wright, Calvin E. and Kim, Yungho. A study of the characteristics of effective individualized programs. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152 828, 1977.

Yap, Kim Onn et al. Effects of data analysis methods and selection procedures in regression models. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 175 904, 1979.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS

E.O.F. (JUNIOR HIGH) PROGRAM

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

QUESTIONNAIRE

EVALUATION CONSULTANTS (EDMONTON) LTD.

FEBRUARY, 1981

INSTRUCTIONS

Please provide the information asked for in the items below. As we said in our covering letter, the I.D. number which appears on the questionnaire is to be used only to help us in any follow-up work we do in order to obtain a reasonably high percentage of returns from our survey. All of the information you provide will be kept anonymous in our report to Alberta Education. For each item, please circle the most appropriate numbered response. The category "No Opinion" is to be circled when you have no knowledge on which to base your judgement about the item.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Background Information

1. Your Position:

	Contact Person	1
	Teacher, Counsellor, etc.	2
	Employer	3
	Parent	4
	Outside Agency	5
	(Please specify agency)	
	.....	

$\overline{1}$ $\overline{2}$ $\overline{3}$ $\overline{4}$

$\overline{5}$

2. Years associated with the E.O.F. (Junior High) project:

	1979-80	1
	1980-81	2
	Both of the above	3

$\overline{6}$

I.D. # _ _ _ _ _ _

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Section A

The following items deal with your opinions about the local E.O.F. project with which you are acquainted.

3. With respect to achievement of its intended objectives, the local E.O.F. project performance has been: 7

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Good	Fair	Limited	Poor	No Opinion

4. Any side effects of the E.O.F. project have been positive. 8

5	4	3	2	1	0
Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	No Opinion

5. The effect of the project upon the attitudes of the students enroled in it has been: 9

5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No Opinion

6. The effect of the project upon the school work habits of the students enroled in it has been: 10

5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No Opinion

7. The effect of the project upon the self-concept of students has been: 11

5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No Opinion

8. The effect of the project in terms of its demands upon your time and energy has been: 12

5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely Heavy	Very Heavy	Heavy	Light	Very Light	No Opinion

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

9. Community reaction to the project has been: 13

5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No Opinion

10. Employers' attitudes to the project have been: 14

5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No Opinion

11. Parents' attitudes to the project have been: 15

5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very Negative	No Opinion

Section B

The following items deal with your opinions about the provincial E.O.F. (Junior High) program as you see it.

12. With respect to achievement of its objectives, the ...vince-wide E.O.F. (Junior High) funding program ... been: 16

5	4	3	2	1	0
...cellent	Good	Fair	Limited	Poor	No Opinion

13. The administrative requirements (e.g. proposals, reports, contracts, evaluations, etc.) of the provincial E.O.F. program have been: 17

5	4	3	2	1	0
Very Extensive	Extensive	Moderate	Limited	Not at all Extensive	No Opinion

14. Please list in the boxes below up to three (if any) positive side effects which the E.O.F. program has had in your school, school district, in the family, the community, or elsewhere. (Put only one positive side effect in each box)

18

(1 = comment)

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

19

(1 = comment)

20

(1 = comment)

15. Please list in the boxes below, up to three (if any) negative side effects which the E.O.F. program has had in your school, school district, in the family, the community, or elsewhere. (Put only one negative side effect in each box)

21

(1 = comment)

22

(1 = comment)

23

(1 = comment)

16. The method of funding projects designed for the types of students served by the E.O.F. (Junior High) program which you prefer is:

24

Inclusion of such funds in the regular foundation program grants 1

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

16. (Continued)

Special funding (which is currently being used for E.O.F. (Junior High) projects) 2

No Opinion 3

17. Should the E.O.F. (Junior High) program continue beyond the initial three-year period (1979-82)? 25

Yes 1

No 2

No Opinion 3

18. Please list, in the boxes below, up to three (if any) changes you would like to see in the regulations and/or the procedures used in the E.O.F. (Junior High) provincial program. (Put only one change in each box)

26

(1 = comment)

27

(1 = comment)

28

(1 = comment)

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please seal it in the envelope and return it to Evaluation Consultants (Edm.) Ltd. no later than one week after you receive it.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

E.O.F. External Evaluation

Please announce to interviewee:

I am _____ from Evaluation Consultants (Edm.) Ltd.. Evaluation Consultants (Edm.) Ltd. has been commissioned by the Alberta Department of Education to carry out the external evaluation of the Educational Opportunities Fund (Junior High) program. As part of the evaluation, we are interviewing some of the people that have had some involvement with an E.O.F. program. Thank you for consenting to meet with me today. This interview should last approximately 30 minutes. All of the information you provide will be kept anonymous.

Background Information

1. E.O.F. Project
   (a) Project Title _____
   (b) School _____
   (c) City or Town _____

2. Interviewee's Position (Please check)
   (a) Contact person ____
   (b) Teacher, counsellor, etc. ____
   (c) Employer ____
   (d) Parent ____
   (e) Outside agency ____
   (Please specify agency) _____

3. Years of interviewee's association with project (Please check)
   (a) 1979-80 ____
   (b) 1980-81 ____